

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion, is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request entry of this response, as the response places the application in clear condition for allowance or alternatively places the claims in better form for appeal. Specifically, Applicants have amended the claims to overcome an outstanding rejection.

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the application; Claims 1-4 having been amended by way of the present response. Applicants respectfully assert that support for the changes to the claims is self-evident from the originally filed disclosure, including the original claims, and that therefore no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,397,020 to Kim in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,406 to Funamizu et al. (Funamizu). Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims have overcome the rejections for the following reasons.

The present invention is directed to image forming apparatuses (e.g., independent Claims 1 and 2), as well as methods of forming an image (e.g., independent Claims 3 and 4). Independent Claims 1 and 2 recite a detection device configured to detect a type of a sheet based on an amount of light reflected by a surface of the sheet, the detection device disposed below an opening formed in a guide plate configured to guide the sheet during conveyance of the sheet. Independent Claims 3 and 4 recite providing a detection device below an opening formed in a guide plate configured to guide the sheet during conveyance of the sheet, the detection device configured to detect a type of a sheet based on an amount of light reflected by a surface of the sheet.

Kim is directed to an image printing apparatus and control method. Applicants respectfully assert that Kim does not teach or suggest, however, the claimed features of a detection device configured to detect a type of a sheet based on an amount of light reflected by a surface of a sheet, the detection device disposed below an opening formed in a guide plate configured to guide the sheet during conveyance of the sheet, as recited in independent Claims 1-4. The Office Action concedes that Kim does not teach or suggest a detection device configured to detect a type of a sheet based on an amount of light reflected by a surface of a sheet, and therefore Applicants respectfully assert that Kim also does not teach or suggest such a detection device disposed below an opening formed in a guide plate configured to guide the sheet during conveyance of the sheet.

The Office Action relies on Funamizu in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies of Kim. Applicants respectfully assert that Funamizu does not remedy these deficiencies, however, for the following reasons.

Funamizu is directed to a sheet detection apparatus. Applicants respectfully assert that Funamizu does not teach or suggest, however, the claimed features of a detection device configured to detect a type of a sheet based on an amount of light reflected by a surface of a sheet, the detection device disposed below an opening formed in a guide plate configured to guide the sheet during conveyance of the sheet, as recited in independent Claims 1-4.

Applicants respectfully assert that as shown in Figure 2, for example, of Funamizu, a sheet surface detecting sensor 312 is disposed above sheets disposed in cassettes 114/115, rather than below an opening formed in a guide plate configured to guide the sheet during conveyance of the sheet.

Thus, for the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request assert that neither Kim nor Funamizu, whether taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the claimed features recited in independent Claims 1-4. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that

Application No. 10/757,408
Reply to Office Action of December 2, 2004

the rejection of Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn, and the allowance of independent Claims 1-4.

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 5-24 are allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend, as well as for their own features. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of dependent Claims 5-24.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-24 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Customer Number


22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record

Philip J. Hoffmann
Registration No. 46,340

GJM/PH/me

I:\ATTY\PH\24S\247585\PRP AM 01.21.05.DOC